



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/783,390	02/20/2004	Otman Adam Basir	60,449-095	6422

26096 7590 07/07/2005

CARLSON, GASKEY & OLDS, P.C.
400 WEST MAPLE ROAD
SUITE 350
BIRMINGHAM, MI 48009

EXAMINER

TO, TUAN C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3663

DATE MAILED: 07/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/783,390

Applicant(s)

BASIR ET AL.

Examiner

Tuan C. To

Art Unit

3663

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 February 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 20 February 2004 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>02/20, 09/17/04</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

The drawings are objected to because in the drawings, figures 1 through 4 contain hand-sketches. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the

Art Unit: 3663

subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Owechko et al. and in view of Tsai (US 20020076088A1).

With respect to claim 1, Owechko et al. teach a system/method for classifying an occupant (see Owechko et al, abstract), including the image sensor (Owechko et al, column 2, lines 39-58) for capturing an image of an occupant area, and means for classifying the an occupant in the occupant area based on feature data (Owechko et al, column 2, lines 59-67, column 3, lines 1-24).

Owechko et al. do not disclose the following: "dividing the image into a plurality of subimages of predetermined spatial regions, generating a spatial feature matrix of the image based upon the plurality of subimages, and analyzing the spatial feature matrix".

The secondary reference to Tsai has been cited to overcome the missing features from Owechko et al. by directing to a system and method of multi-level facial image recognition, including the acts of: dividing the image into a plurality of subimages of predetermined spatial regions (Tsai, abstract; figure 1), generating a spatial feature matrix of the image based upon a plurality of subimages (Tsai, figures 6 and 7), and analyzing the spatial feature matrix (Tsai, figure 7).

Hence, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Owechko et al. to include the teachings as taught by Tsai to gain the advantage therefore (ie, properly deploying the safety airbag system according to the size of the occupant on the seat, avoiding the injury to a child that may be caused by the deployment of safety devices).

With regard to claim 2, Owechko et al. teach that the image features is derived from image edges, motion, and range are used (Owechko et al, abstract).

With regard to claim 3, Tsai teaches the act of "smoothing the classification of the occupant overtime" (Tsai, filter shown in figure 3 for smoothing the classification of the occupant overtime).

With regard to claim 4, Owechko et al. teach that determining whether to activate an active restrain based upon the classification of an occupant (Owechko et al, abstract).

With regard to claim 5, Tsai discloses the following: "applying expert classifier algorithm to the spatial feature matrix" (Tsai, figure 5).

With regard to claim 6, Owechko et al. teach the image sensor (Owechko et al, column 2, lines 39-58) captures a plurality of images of known occupant classifications of the occupant area (see figure 10).

With regard to claim 7, Tsai teaches “analyzing the spatial feature matrix based upon the classification of an occupant” (Tsai, figure 7).

With regard to claim 8, Owechko et al. disclose the following: “the expert classifier algorithm includes a neural network” (Owechko et al, figure 1, classifiers 135, 145, and 155).

With regard to claims 9 and 10, Owechko et al. teach that the image features is derived based on the edges, motion, and range (Owechko et al., abstract; figure 10).

With regard to claim 11, Owechko et al. disclose that “physical data representing a physical orientation and location of the occupant area” (Owechko et al, figure 10).

With regard to claims 12 and 13, Owechko et al. teach that the image of occupant is detected by the image sensor. A plurality of features of images are captured, then these features are processed by the classification algorithm to product class confidences.

With regard to claim 14, Owechko et al. teach the following: “the plurality of subimages overlap one another” (Owechko et al., figure 1, column 4, lines 41-62).

With respect to claims 15 and 18, With respect to claim 1, Owechko et al. teach a system/method for classifying an occupant (see Owechko et al, abstract), including the image sensor (Owechko et al, column 2, lines 39-58) for capturing an image of an

Art Unit: 3663

occupant area, and means for classifying the an occupant in the occupant area based on feature data (Owechko et al, column 2, lines 59-67, column 3, lines 1-24).

Owechko et al. do not disclose the following: "a processor dividing the image into a plurality of subimages, the processor analyzing the subimages to determine a classification of the occupant".

The secondary reference to Tsai has been cited to overcome the missing features from Owechko et al. by directing to a system and method of multi-level facial image recognition, including the acts of: dividing the image into a plurality of subimages of predetermined spatial regions (Tsai, abstract; figure 1), generating a spatial feature matrix of the image based upon a plurality of subimages (Tsai, figures 6 and 7), and analyzing the spatial feature matrix (Tsai, figure 7).

Neither Owechko et al. nor Tsai mentioned about a processor for performing the act of dividing the image into a plurality of subimages, analyzing the subimages to determine a classification of the occupant. However, such feature is inherent disclosed in Tsai because a processor should be included in order to perform the act of dividing the images into a plurality of images, analyzing the subimages to determine a classification of the occupant.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Owechko et al. to include the teachings as taught by Tsai to gain the advantage therefore (ie, properly deploying the safety airbag system according to the size of the occupant on the seat, avoiding the injury to a child that may be caused by the deployment of safety devices).

With regard to claims 16 and 17, Owechko et al. teach that the classification of the occupant from among the classifications including: adult, child, and infant seat (Owechko et al., abstract). It should be noted that Owechko et al. do not mentioned the claimed processor, however, such feature is inherently disclosed in Owechko et al, so that occupant classification and the engagement of safety devices in according to the classification.

With regard to claim 19, Tsai teaches the act of "smoothing the classification of the occupant overtime" (Tsai, filter shown in figure 3 for smoothing the classification of the occupant overtime).

With regard to claim 20, Owechko et al. teach that the image features is derived from image edges, motion, and range are used (Owechko et al, abstract).

With regard to claim 21, Owechko et al. disclose the following: "the expert classifier algorithm includes a neural network" (Owechko et al, figure 1, classifiers 135, 145, and 155).

With regard to claim 22, Tsai teaches the act of "smoothing the classification of the occupant overtime" (Tsai, filter shown in figure 3 for smoothing the classification of the occupant overtime).

With regard to claim 23, Owechko et al. discloses "a confidence weighting function applied to the plurality of previous occupant classification to determine the present occupant classification" (Owechko et al, figure 1, 136).

With regard to claim 24, Tsai teaches that a plurality of digital filters extracting low-level descriptors from each of the subimages, analyzing the low-level descriptors to

Art Unit: 3663

determine the classification of the occupant (see Tsai, figure 3). As discussed herein, Tsai inherently disclose a processor for certainly performing the act of analyzing as stated above.

With respect to claim 25, Owechko et al. teach a system/method for classifying an occupant (see Owechko et al, abstract), including the image sensor (Owechko et al, column 2, lines 39-58) for capturing an image of an occupant area, and means for classifying the an occupant in the occupant area based on feature data (Owechko et al, column 2, lines 59-67, column 3, lines 1-24).

Owechko et al. do not disclose the following: "dividing the image into a plurality of subimages of predetermined spatial regions, generating a plurality of low-level descriptors from each of the plurality of subimages".

The secondary reference to Tsai has been cited to overcome the missing features from Owechko et al. by directing to a system and method of multi-level facial image recognition, including the acts of: dividing the image into a plurality of subimages of predetermined spatial regions (Tsai, abstract; figure 1), generating a plurality of low-level descriptors based upon a plurality of subimages (Tsai, figures 6 and 7), and analyzing the low-level descriptors (Tsai, figure 7).

Hence, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Owechko et al. to include the teachings as taught by Tsai to gain the advantage therefore (ie, properly deploying the safety airbag system according to the size of the occupant on the seat, avoiding the injury to a child that may be caused by the deployment of safety devices).

With regard to claim 26, Owechko et al. teach the image sensor (Owechko et al, column 2, lines 39-58) captures a plurality of images of known occupant classifications of the occupant area (see figure 10).

With regard to claim 27, Tsaid teaches "analyzing the spatial feature matrix based upon the classification of an occupant" (Tsai, figure 7).

With regard to claim 28, Owechko et al. disclose the following: "the expert classifier algorithm includes a neural network" (Owechko et al, figure 1, classifiers 135, 145, and 155).

With regard to claim 29, Owechko et al. teach that the image features is derived based on the edges, motion, and range (Owechko et al., abstract; figure 10).

With regard to claim 30, Owechko et al. teach that the image features is derived based on the edges, motion, and range (Owechko et al., abstract; figure 10).

With regard to claim 31, Owechko et al. disclose that "physical data representing a physical orientation and location of the occupant area" (Owechko et al, figure 10).

Conclusions

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tuan C To whose telephone number is (571) 272-6985. The examiner can normally be reached on from 8:00AM to 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jack Keith can be reached on 571-272-6878.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3663

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/tc

June 23, 2005


JACK KEITH
PRIMARY EXAMINER
SPE 3663